



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

P. Papinii Statii Silvarum Libri herausgegeben und erklärt von
FRIEDRICH VOLLMER. Leipzig, Druck und Verlag von
B. G. Teubner, 1898. xvi + 598 pp. Preis geh. M. 16.

A welcome addition to the resources of the student of Roman literature is Vollmer's edition of Statius' *Silvae*. A good commentary has long been needed for this work, crowded as it is with allusions to ancient localities, buildings and works of art, and to the customs of Roman public and private life. The progress of knowledge in archaeology has been so rapid since the days of Markland and Lemaire that it was worth while to apply the results of more than half a century of research to the elucidation of these interesting poems. This Vollmer has done and much besides. The book, dedicated to Professor Franz Buecheler on the completion of twenty-five years' academic work at Bonn, contains an introduction (pp. 1-52), text with critical apparatus, *auctores*, *imitatores* and *testimonia* (pp. 55-202), commentary (pp. 204-554), appendix treating prosody and metre (pp. 555-60), and indices (pp. 561-98), the latter comprising an index of proper names and an index to the introduction and commentary compiled by H. Saftien. Following the preface are seven closely printed pages of *addenda et corrigenda*.

In the first part of the introduction the time of composition of the individual poems, the dates of publication of the different books, and the life and character of the poet are discussed. Vollmer thinks (p. 11 f.) that while the poems of the first three books were written between 90 and 94, these books were published almost at the same time (93/94), after the completion of the *Thebais* (92/93), the publication of which cannot, in his opinion, be more definitely fixed than some time before 95. But H. Nohl¹ and R. Helm² seem to have good ground for their contention when they argue from *Theb.* I 19 bis *adactum legibus Histrum*, and *Martial*, IX 101, 17 (dated 94) *cornua Sarmatici ter perfida contudit Histri*, that the *Thebais* was published before the Sarmatian war of 92. Support for this view is found in the difference of tone between *praef.* I *adhuc pro Thebaide mea, quamvis me reliquerit, timeo* and *Silv.* IV 4, 87 f., ib. 7, 27 f., written in the summer of 95. All the time from 92 to 95 is required to account

¹ *Quaestiones Statianae*, p. 23 f.

² *De P. Papinii Statii Thebaide*, p. 157.

for so great a change. The similarity of the prefaces to bks. I, II and III proves nothing, while the separation of II.2 and III.1, both addressed to Pollius Felix, militates strongly against Vollmer's theory. Is it not possible, too, that Vollmer has wrongly interpreted the passage in praef. IV *reor equidem aliter quam inuocato numine maximi imperatoris nullum opusculum meum coepisse*? Understanding *opusculum* as a whole book, he argues that the statement is true of the Thebais, *Silvae* bks. I-III, bk. IV, and the Achilleis, not of bks. II and III alone. But Statius regularly uses *opusculum*, as he does *ecloga* and *libellus*, to refer to single poems, and there seems to be no good reason for thus forcing its meaning in this case. He has never begun any poem without invoking, mentally if not in verse, the divine assistance of the Emperor as his inspiring muse. Compare praef. II, l. 3 and praef. IV, l. 22; Pliny, Epist. VIII 21, 4; Archiv f. lat. Lex. u. Gram. VI 247, 252 f. The evidence seems to point to the publication of the Thebais in 92 or the end of 91, shortly before the appearance of *Silvae*, bk. I in 92. Bks. II and III were sent forth separately in 93/94.—With good reason Vollmer (p. 19) rejects the view, accepted for example by M. Schanz,¹ that Statius left Rome on account of the *repulsa Capitolina*. This failure and the Alban success are rightly placed in the year 90; the poet's ill-health sufficiently accounts for his change of residence. In his estimate of Statius as man and courtier (p. 21), the editor takes a more favorable view than, for instance, Macaulay or Teuffel, and apologizes for his flattery of the Emperor, which after all, when compared with Martial's, seems not so excessive.

Of the valuable chapter on the *Würdigung und Geschichte der Silvae* little need be said. Besides a discussion of the name *silva* and the type of literature to which these poems belong, their popularity and treatment at the hands of scholars up to our own time are traced in clear outlines. On p. 29 the editor has perhaps made too much of the phrases given by Kerckhoff as common-places in Statius. Many of them occur only twice and some are just as characteristic of other authors. A carefully written account of the manuscripts follows from the pen of Moritz Krohn, from whom we may expect soon to receive a critical edition of the *Silvae* in the Teubner series. The brief appendix on the wars of Domitian, though prepared without the assistance of Gsell's valuable book, *Essai sur le règne de l'empereur Domitien*, Paris, 1893, will yet prove useful. To prevent a possible misunderstanding on p. 48, n. 6, I would suggest the addition of the cross-reference Vgl. S. 49, Anm. 9.

In his constitution of the text Vollmer has wisely revolted from the subjective methods which have played too large a part in the criticism of the *Silvae*, and is generally guided by the more conservative principles which he professes on p. v. Apart from

¹ *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, I 2, 311.

the fact that he has rejected a host of unnecessary emendations, he marks a distinct advance over his predecessors. In the readings noted by Angelo Poliziano on the margin of the *editio princeps* now in the Corsini library at Rome, Vollmer has carefully distinguished between those expressly attributed to the *codex Sangallensis* found by Poggio (A*) and those whose source is not directly stated (A). The former class only he considers as the record of the best tradition; the overestimation of the latter was a notable weakness in the edition of Baehrens. A comparison of A*—which, unfortunately, includes only eighty readings—with the extant fifteenth-century manuscripts reveals the fact that the *Matritensis*, agreeing in all but six, stands nearest the lost *codex Sangallensis*. In view of this it is not the least merit of the present editor to have been the first to bring the readings of this manuscript to bear upon the text of the *Silvae*.¹ From the complete collation placed at Vollmer's disposal by M. Krohn, only the most important readings are printed.

The commentary is an excellent piece of work and will win the commendation of all students of Statius. Especially valuable are the carefully prepared analyses, which often throw light on the rhetorical structure of the poems and show how far Statius was under the influence of the schools. The editor has endeavored to sustain the happy mean between diffuseness and excessive brevity, and has on the whole succeeded. In many passages where readings hitherto rejected must be defended, long discussions are necessary, but are seldom unduly prolonged. A close comparison with the commentaries of Markland and Lemaire shows the value and importance of the new edition. A few of the readings and interpretations may be briefly noticed. The comment to praef. I, l. 2 (p. 209), reads: "*hos libellos* die einzelnen Gedichte (wie Horaz S. I 10, 92)." While there is no doubt that this is the usage for Statius, our editor will find few scholars to agree with him for this passage of Horace.—On p. 218 we find a new interpretation of I 1, 17 f. Vollmer understands the words *par forma decorque, par honor* to refer to the horse: "seine Grösse und Schönheit entspricht der Ehre, dass es den Kaiser trägt." But this seems to miss the close connection between *maiora* and *par*. If *veris maior*a refers to the comparison with the wooden horse, as he assumes, the meaning should be: 'This horse is as shapely and graceful as the wooden horse.' I would refer *maiora* to the immediately preceding clause and interpret: 'And do not think this statue exceeds the truth: the Emperor himself is just as beautiful and glorious.'—In the oft-emended and much-explained passage I 1, 27 f. our editor, after referring to Hand's edition of 1817 for older attempts,

¹ A. Klotz gives readings of M for *Silv.* II 2, and A. Herzog for I 2; cf. *Curae Statianae*, 1896, p. 9, and *Stati Epithalamium*, 1881.

gives nine more recent emendations, and finally accepts the explanation of the manuscript reading long ago offered by Domizio Calderino. He certainly ought to have mentioned in this connection Macnaghten's¹ ingenious and probably correct defence of the transmitted text, which takes *castris* as the Castra Cornelia described by Caesar, Bell. Civ. II 24.—On p. 222 to l. 34 a cross-reference to IV 2, 18 f. would be helpful.—I cannot agree with Vollmer that emendation is necessary in I 1, 65 (p. 226). While *linguit* is open to no objection on palaeographical grounds, *figit*, which makes equally good sense, should in my opinion be retained and interpreted with Burmann.—The emendation of I 2, 122 *queritur* to *queritor* is an improvement on the *querimur* of Peyraredus and is doubtless right. Not only is the intensive verb well suited to the character of Venus, as Vollmer explains in the Rhein. Mus. LI (1896), p. 35, but the first person singular brings it into agreement with the preceding *dederim* and the following *iussi*.—It is hard to believe that the definite reference to time in Silvae, V 3, 29 is a mere fiction (pp. 526 and 9, n. 10), and it is most improbable that after a lapse of years Statius could have had any reason for thus antedating his poem, especially a poem of this character. The view of Klotz (Curae Stadianae, 1896, p. 61) and Friedländer (Sittengeschichte, III⁶, p. 479) seems to be more reasonable.

The influence of earlier authors on Statius and of Statius on later writers is discussed briefly in the introduction, and parallel passages are quoted in their proper place beneath the text. To be sure, this list of *auctores et imitatores* could have been much enlarged. Add, for example, to I 1, 8 Martial, III 95, 7 *notumque per oppida nomen*; to II 6, 53 Plaut. Amph. 960 *voltum e voltu comparet*; to III 3, 201 Iuv. II 6, Mart. I 109, 19, and IX 101, 1; to IV 6, 39 Mart. II 75, 9, X 31, 5, Iuv. VIII 29, Sen. Quaest. Nat. III, pr. §3, Epist. VII 2 (64), §4, Benef. II 11, 1; to V 2, 10 f. Hor. Sat. I 5, 43. Many passages, too, which are mentioned in the commentary might have been included, e. g. to I 3, 26 Hor. Sat. II 3, 53 f. For imitations in Apollinaris Sidonius the monograph of R. Bitschofsky² would have been serviceable, while that of H. de la Ville de Mirmont³ would have given a number of echoes in the Mosella of Ausonius not here noted. Interesting as it would be to see the influence of Statius on mediaeval and modern literature fully treated, that subject does not properly lie within the scope of an edition. As far as English authors are concerned, until the present century few ancient poets were more popular than he; but the reminiscences, quotations and translations are, if my memory serves me, almost entirely from his epic poems.

¹ Journal of Philology, XIX (1891), p. 129.

² De C. Sollii Apollinaris Sidonii studiis Stadianis, Vindob. 1881.

³ De Ausonii Mosella, Paris, 1892.

The bibliographical lists (pp. 1, 204-6) form a valuable addition to the book, but it is to be regretted that they are not made complete for the more recent literature of the subject. Here and on p. 237 I miss the monographs on L. Arruntius Stella, Doelling, Einige Notizen über den Dichter Stella aus Patavium, Plauen, 1840, and P. Rasi, De L. Arruntio Stella, poeta Patavino, Padua, 1890. The following also might with advantage have been added: R. Bitschowsky, Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Paed. 121 (1880), p. 499 f.; id., Wien. Stud. III (1881) 159; id., De C. Sollii Apollinaris Sidonii studiis Statianis, Vindob. 1881; H. Blass, Rhein. Mus. XXX (1875), pp. 458-63; O. A. Danielsson, Eranos, II (1897), p. 43 f.; R. Ellis, Jour. of Phil. XV (1886), p. 3 f.; id., ib. XX (1892), pp. 17-24; G. Lafaye, Revue de Phil. XX (1896), pp. 53-6; Th. Mommsen, Korr.-Bl. d. westd. Zeitschrift, V 216; O. Müller, Rhein. Mus. XVIII (1863), p. 200; H. Nissen, Rhein. Mus. XL (1885), p. 358 f.: cf. A. Mommsen, Burs. Jahresb. LXIX (1891), pp. 140 f., 143; K. Rossberg, Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Paed. 123 (1881), pp. 143-4; Fr. Skutsch, Wien. Stud. XVII (1895), p. 160; J. Vahlen, Ind. lect. Berl. 1895-96; C. Wachsmuth, Rhein. Mus. XXIX (1874), p. 355 f.; A. Riese, Rhein. Mus. LI (1896), p. 637 f.; A. Klotz, Phil.-hist. Beiträge f. Wachsmuth (1897), p. 167 f.; F. Lohr, De infinitivi apud Statium et Iuvenalem usu, Marb. 1876; P. J. Oesterberg, De structura verborum c. praep. comp. ap. Val. Flaccum, Statium, Martialem, Holmiae, 1883; A. Zingerle, Zu späteren lateinischen Dichtern, I, II, Innsbruck, 1873, 1879. A few of these monographs are referred to in the introduction or commentary, as, e. g., A. Zingerle on p. 30, n. 10. Such scattered references might have been collected and others not mentioned anywhere in the book might have been added; for the usefulness of a bibliography increases in proportion to its completeness, especially for the more recent contributions to the subject.

That the printing of the introduction and text in 1895 and the commentary in 1897/8 would cause damage to the work as a whole, was doubtless foreseen by the editor, who in his later preface apologizes for the lack of harmony and asks that in some passages the text be corrected by the commentary. An example will illustrate the conditions to which I refer. The text of Praef. I, l. 13 is *quamvis timeo ne* with the critical note *quamvis mimeone; corr. s.* In the commentary (p. 211) we find: "Durch ein ärgerliches Versehen ist im Apparate *quamvis mimeo* als Ueberlieferung stehen geblieben, während M¹ hat *quam meone* und erst M², dem die jüngeren Handschriften folgen, an den Rand schrieb *quis*. St. kann also ebensogut *quamquam* geschrieben haben; eine der verzeichneten Ausonstellen empfiehlt sogar diese Annahme." Turning to the *addenda et corrigenda* (p. x) we read: "Meine Angabe im Apparate, die Ueberlieferung sei *quamvis mimeone* war doch gut begründet. . . . Wahrscheinlich ist *qua* in M¹ Schreibfehler für *quis*, also *quamvis* für überliefert zu

halten." The recurrence of such cases is unpleasant, to say the least, and must be as annoying to the editor himself as it is troublesome to his readers.

In conclusion one blemish must be pointed out, a serious blemish in any book, but especially in one where exactness is of such importance. I refer to the large number of errors and inaccuracies in reference, quotation and the like, some of them of little consequence, others quite misleading. An inaccurate reference or quotation may seem a matter of slight moment, providing it does not cause serious difficulty or misunderstanding, and any one who has seen even a few pages through the press knows how difficult it is to avoid some slips of this sort. But the presence of errors in such large numbers—if the whole book may be judged by the few pages which I have tested from this point of view—lessens confidence and distinctly detracts from the scientific value of the work. Let me give some of the examples which I have noticed, including a few which are merely typographical: p. ix, addend. to p. 30, read *Hor. A. P. 47 . . . iunctura nouum*, and in A. P. 52 for *seu* read *si*; p. x, addend. to p. 30, read III 5, 73; p. 1, for *Ruedeger*, 1888, read *Ruediger*, 1887, so p. 422, l. 23, but correct on p. 213, l. 7; p. 6, n. 7, read *v. 6 post patrii laetum*; p. 7, n. 10, read *v. 142/3*; p. 8, n. 5 fin., for *Anm. 6* read *Anm. 3*; p. 9, with l. 10, *ediert Sommer 94*, compare l. 21, *ediert Mitte oder Ende 94*; p. 9, n. 7, read *quos Saturnalibus una risimus*; p. 11, n. 4, l. 3, for *idem* read *iam*; p. 14, n. 3, l. 1, read *IV 2, 66 f.*; p. 16, n. 6, read *S. III 5, 13*; p. 23, l. 4 from end, read *vita Vaccae Lucans*, and for *adversus* read *adversum*; p. 29, n. 1, l. 8, read *134 celsusque*; p. 31, l. 14, read *zu*; p. 36, n. 2, l. 7, for *Gevartii succidanea* read *Crucei succidanea*; p. 39, n. 1, read *Additional Manuscripts*; p. 48, n. 6, for *3. Sept. 84 imp. V* read *3. Sept. 84 imp. VII*¹; p. 51, n. 6 fin., read *Marcellinus IX 45*; p. 52, n. 2, l. 1, read *III 3, 171*, and *ib.*, l. 5, for *improbis* read *improbo*. The bibliographical list, too, is not free from errors, especially in dates: p. 204, middle, Henry's article appeared in *Neue Jahrb. f. klass. Phil.* 93 (1866), 642 ff.; *ib.*, l. 9 from end, Madvig has two articles on the *Silvae* in *Adversaria Critica*, viz. I 149 to *Silv.* II 6, 64 and II 157 ff. to more than a dozen other passages; Vollmer has combined the two in the following unhappy manner: *N Madvig adversaria critica II (1873) 152 ff. zu II 6, 64*; p. 205, l. 13, *M Haupt Hermes XIII 180* is a false entry for *Hermes, VIII (1874) 180 f.*, which is in its right place on the preceding page; *ib.*, l. 14, Köstlin's article in *Phil. XXXVIII (1879) 40 f.* is occupied chiefly with other poets, touching Statius only in the discussion of two passages of the *Thebais*, p. 61 f.; *ib.*, l. 25, R. Ellis wrote on some passages of the *Silvae* in the *Journal of Philology*, XIII (1885), pp. 88–97, not (1882) 91; *ib.*, l. 27, for 1883 read 1878; *ib.*, l. 10 from end, read *Journ. of Philol. XIX*

¹ Cf. *Ephem. Epig.* V 93.

(1891) 129 ff.; ib., l. 4 from end, read *Hermes, XXV* (1890); p. 206, l. 11, read *Hermes, XXVIII* (1893); ib., l. 14, read *F. Vollmer, Textkritisches zu Statius, Rhein. Mus. LI* (1896) 27 ff., not 25 ff. In the commentary I have noted the following: p. 210, l. 1, for *nach V5, 78* read *nach V5, 84*; p. 218 to v. 18, p. 224 to v. 48, and other places where reference is made to the sixth book of the Thebais, the numbering of Kohlmann would have been more acceptable; p. 223 fin., II 2, 113 reads *uoluit*, not *euoluit*, as you would suppose; p. 225, l. 6 from end, read *III 2, III* and insert *limina* after *Phoebea*; p. 226, l. 8, read *62 f.*, 233, and ib., l. 21, read *III 1, 117*; p. 228 to v. 85, l. 2, for *principem* read *Caesarem*; p. 453 to v. 17, l. 5, for *sine ullo* read *sine ulla*. Perhaps the most serious error I have observed in the commentary is on p. 219 to v. 22, where we are told that the temple of Divus Iulius was "dediciert von Augustus am 10. Aug. 27." Of course, the correct date is Aug. 18, 725/29: cf. C. I. L. I², p. 325; Mommsen, *Res Gest. Div. Aug.*, p. 80; Hülsen, *Nom. Topog.*, p. 81.

In spite of its defects, however, this edition is a mine of information and a boon to the student not of Statius only, but of the poets of that period, and will go far toward re-awakening interest in an author who until our own century was one of the most popular of ancient writers.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.

ANGLO-SAXON DICTIONARIES.

An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, based on the Manuscript Collections of the late JOSEPH BOSWORTH, D. D., F. R. S. Edited and enlarged by T. NORTHCOTE TOLLER, M. A., Smith Professor of English in the Owens College, Manchester. Part IV, Section II. *Swiðh-snel-Ýtmest*. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1898.

A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary for the Use of Students. By JOHN R. CLARK HALL, M. A., Ph. D. London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York, Macmillan & Co., 1894.

The Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon. By HENRY SWEET, M. A., Ph. D., LL. D. New York, The Macmillan Company; London, Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1897.

After the lapse of fifteen years since the publication of Parts I and II of the Bosworth-Toller Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, we now have it completed with the issue of Part IV, Section 2. But, as